

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)
Sijem Sipma et al.) Group Art Unit: 1761
Application No.: 10/821,280) Examiner: Timothy F. Simone
Filed: April 9, 2004) Confirmation No.: 1048
For: APPARATUS FOR CUTTING AND)
STIRRING CURD)
)

**DISCUSSION OF STATUS OF CLAIMS AND SUPPORT IN PATENT
DISCLOSURE FOR CHANGES TO CLAIMS**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

By virtue of the Amendment filed concurrently with this paper, original patent Claims 1-6 are pending, as well as new Claims 7-19. None of the original patent claims, nor any of the claims previously added in this reissue application, are canceled.

In the Amendment filed concurrently with this paper, Claims 1, 7, 9-12, 18 and 19 are amended. Accompanying the Amendment is an appendix showing the amendments to Claims 1, 7, 9-12, 18 and 19. Set forth below is an explanation of the support in the disclosure of the patent for the changes made to those claims.

Independent Claim 1 is amended to change the wording reciting that each longitudinal knife has a smaller cross section than the size of each opening, with the longitudinal knives being loosely disposed in the openings with a relatively large play. The amended version of Claim 1 now recites that each longitudinal knife has a

size relative to the size of the openings such that the longitudinal knives are loosely disposed in the openings with a relatively large play.

Support for this language in amended Claim 1 exists at various places in the patent and the drawing figures. For example, the discussion in lines 12-16 of column 4 of the patent states that the openings in the transverse knives allow a longitudinal knife to be slide into them, with the longitudinal knives being loosely disposed in the openings with a relatively large or ample play. Also, Fig. 10 of the original patent illustrates the longitudinal knives being of a size relative to the size of the openings in the transverse knives such that the longitudinal knives are loosely disposed in the openings with play. Further, Fig. 8 of the original patent, which illustrates an alternative form of the openings in which the openings are defined by opposite recesses 39, 40, also illustrates the longitudinal knives 38 having a size relative to the size of the openings in the transverse knives such that the longitudinal knives are loosely disposed in the openings.

The amended version of Claim 7 presented in the accompanying Amendment is amended to change the wording reciting "each opening being larger than the cross-section of each longitudinal knife." The claim now recites --the openings being larger in size than the longitudinal knives--. Support for this language in amended Claim 7 exists, for example, in the discussion in lines 12-16 of column 4 of the patent describing that the openings in the transverse knives allow the longitudinal knives to be loosely disposed in the openings. The openings are thus larger in size than the longitudinal knives so that this loose disposition of the longitudinal knives exists. Also, Figs. 8 and 10 of the original patent illustrate the openings in the transverse knives being larger in size than the longitudinal knives.

Claim 9 presented in the accompanying Amendment is amended to change the wording reciting that the cross-section of each opening in the longitudinal knives is greater than the cross-section of the pin to provide space in the openings around the pin. Amended Claim 9 defines that each opening in the longitudinal knives is of a size relative to the cross-section of the pin to provide space in the openings around the pin. Support for this language can be found, for example, in the discussion in lines 24-28 of column 4 describing that the diameter of the openings in the longitudinal knives is greater than the cross-section of the pin 46. Also, original Fig. 9 of the patent illustrates the opening 44 in the longitudinal knife 38 being of a size relative to the cross-section of the pin 46 to provide a space in the openings around the pin.

The amended version of Claim 10 presented in the accompanying Amendment changes the claim phrase "means for securing the longitudinal knives from longitudinal displacement relative to the transverse knives" to --means for substantially preventing displacement of the longitudinal knives in the longitudinal direction--. Support for this language exists in original patent Claim 1 as well as the description in lines 12-14 of column 2 of the original patent.

The amended version of Claim 11 presented in the accompanying Amendment changes the wording reciting that each opening has a size greater than the cross-section of each longitudinal knife. The amended claim wording recites that each opening has a size greater than the size of each longitudinal knife. As noted above, the discussion in lines 12-16 of column 4 of the patent describes that the openings in the transverse knives allow the longitudinal knives to be loosely disposed in the openings, thus supporting the language reciting that the openings in

the transverse knives have a size greater than the size of the longitudinal knives.

Figs. 8 and 10 of the original patent also illustrate the openings in the transverse knives being larger in size than the longitudinal knives.

Claim 11 is also amended to recite that the openings in the transverse knives --comprise-- recesses aligned with the longitudinal knives, instead of the previous language reciting the openings "having" recesses aligned with the longitudinal knives. The last ten lines of column 4 describes the opposite recesses 39, 40 in the transverse knives that receive the longitudinal knife. Thus in this embodiment, the opening that receives the longitudinal knife is comprised of the opposite recesses 39, 40.

Claim 12 is amended to change the recitation of means for securing the transverse knives to the girders. Amended Claim 12 now recites that the transverse knives are connected to the girders. Support for this wording exists at various places in the patent such as the description at lines 8 and 9 of column 4.

Claim 12 is also amended to change the language reciting that the longitudinal knives are arranged in pairs and that a part is secured to the longitudinal knives at the opposite ends of the longitudinal knives so that the part joins pairs of the longitudinal knives. Amended Claim 12 instead defines that the openings in each transverse knife are in register with corresponding openings of others of the transverse knives and through which the longitudinal knives pass, and that each longitudinal knife comprises two legs connected by a part. Lines 12-14 of column 4 of the patent describe that each opening in the transverse knife is in register with corresponding openings of other transverse knives, and the opening permit a longitudinal knife to be slid therein. Also, the description at the top of column 5 of the

patent states that the longitudinal knives can be comprised of legs connected by a part 42. In the illustrated embodiment, the legs and the part 42 form a U-shaped longitudinal knife.

Claim 18 is amended for consistency with the language in amended Claim 7. That is, the recitation that the "means for preventing the longitudinal knives from longitudinal movement relative to the transverse knives comprises one end of the longitudinal knives being welded to one of the transverse knives" is changed to recite that the --means for preventing the longitudinal knives from longitudinal movement comprises one end of the longitudinal knives being welded to one of the transverse knives--. Support for this language is found in the original patent as noted above in the discussion of Claim 7. Also, the discussion beginning in line 18 of column 6 describes that the longitudinal knives can be welded to the transverse knives to prevent longitudinal movement of the longitudinal knives.

Claim 19 is amended for consistency with the language in amended Claim 10. Thus, the claim wording reciting that "the means for securing the longitudinal knives from longitudinal displacement relative to the transverse knives comprises one end of the longitudinal knives being welded to one of the transverse knives" is changed. Amended Claim 19 now recites that --the means for substantially preventing displacement of the longitudinal knives in the longitudinal direction comprises one end of the longitudinal knives being welded to one of the transverse knives.-- Support for this language exists in the original patent as noted above in the discussion of Claim 10. Also, the discussion beginning in line 18 of column 6

describes that the longitudinal knives can be welded to the transverse knives to prevent longitudinal movement of the longitudinal knives.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: July 23, 2007

By: Matthew Schneider
Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 32,814

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620